REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated September 30, 2005, claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bruijns* (5,974,113) in view of *Bolorforosh* (6,132,377). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has several steps including generating an image ratio of the first image and the second image, the image ratio having a numerator and a denominator. The claim further recites regularizing the image ratio by adding a constant to the denominator to form a regularized image ratio, filtering the regularized image ratio to form a filtered image ratio and multiplying the second image by the filter ratio to form an adjusted image. This is generally taught in paragraph 24 of the present application. As the Examiner points out in the present application, the Bruijns reference does not expressly disclose a ratio having a numerator and a denominator, regularizing the image ratio by adding a constant to the denominator to form a regularized ratio. The Bolorforosh reference is set forth for this teaching. Applicants admit that the Bolorforosh reference does teach regularizing a ratio by adding a non-zero constant to the denominator. However, the ratio set forth is the ratio of the fundamental receive signal to the harmonic receive signal. Applicants respectfully submit that although a regularized ratio is set forth, the ratio itself is not a ratio of a first image and a second image. Rather, the ratio is a ratio of the fundamental and harmonic frequencies. Column 4, lines 17-26, emphasize this point, This paragraph states that in step 64 the ratio signal R is formed as a function of the fundamental and harmonic receive signals. Then, the image signal is generated as a function of the signal ratio R. This is very different from the steps set forth in Claim 1 in that the image ratio is set forth and not a ratio. That is, the first step of Claim 1 is generating an image ratio of the first image and the second image. The Bolorforosh reference does not form a ratio of image signals but rather forms a ratio of the fundamental frequency and the harmonic frequency which in turn forms the image. Thus, no image ratio is formed and therefore the combination of the references does not form the present claim.

Likewise, Claim 10 also recites an image ratio of the first image and the second image. As mentioned above, this is not taught or suggested in either of the references.

Claim 18 also recites a similar image ratio. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider independent Claims 1, 10 and 18.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 19-20 are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above since these claims are dependent upon allowable independent claims.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Bruijns in view of Bolorforosh in further view of Poland (6,080,107). Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are dependent upon allowable base claims. Applicants respectfully submit that no teaching or suggestion is found in the Poland reference for generating an image ratio using two images. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of these claims as well.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

> Respectfully submitted, ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

> > Kevin G. Mierzwa

Reg. No. 38,049 28333 Telegraph Road

Suite 250

Southfield, MI 48034 (248) 223-9500

Date: 11-28-2005